UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

| Case No. | 8:23-cv-02193-SVW-SSC | Date: July 15, 2024 |
|---|--|---|
| Title Reshma Kamath v. Elwood Lui, et al. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Present: | Γhe Honorable <u>Stephanie S</u> | Christensen, U.S. Magistrate Judge |
| | Teagan Snyder | n/a |
| | Deputy Clerk | Court Reporter / Recorder |
| Attorr | neys Present for Plaintiffs: None Present | Attorneys Present for Defendants: None Present |
| | | |

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) Order Denying Request for Extension of Time (ECF 23) and Order to Show Cause Why Action Should Not Be Dismissed

On November 22, 2023, attorney Plaintiff Reshma Kamath acting *pro se* filed a civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (ECF 1), followed by a first amended complaint on April 1, 2024 (ECF 15).

On May 1, 2024, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the first amended complaint. (ECF 18.) The Court set a deadline of May 24, 2024, for Plaintiff to file any opposition to the motion to dismiss. (ECF 19.) On May 24, 2024, Plaintiff filed a request for extension of time until July 3, 2024, to file her opposition. (ECF 20.) Over Defendants' objection, the Court granted Plaintiff's request for an extension of the deadline and ordered Plaintiff to file her opposition no later July 3, 2024. (ECF 22.) The Court cautioned Plaintiff that "[n]o further extensions of time to file this opposition will be granted." (*Id.*) On July

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

| Case No. | 8:23-cv-02193-SVW-SSC | Date: July 15, 2024 |
|----------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Title | Reshma Kamath v. Elwood Lui, et al. | |

4, 2024, a day after the deadline for Plaintiff to file her opposition, she filed a second request for extension of the deadline to file an opposition to the motion to dismiss, requesting an extension of the filing deadline to July 12, 2024. (ECF 23.) The reason for the extension request was deadlines she faced in other legal cases.

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's belated request for extension of time (ECF 23) is **DENIED**. As stated above, the Court advised Plaintiff in its May 29, 2024, order extending the filing deadline to July 3, 2024, that no additional extensions of time to file Plaintiff's opposition to the motion to dismiss would be granted. In addition, Plaintiff did not file this request for an extension of time until one day after the previously set deadline for filing her opposition. Further, in the belated extension request, Plaintiff asked to have until July 12, 2024, to file her opposition. That date has passed and Plaintiff still has not filed an opposition to the motion to dismiss.

Plaintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE, in writing, by **July 25**, **2024**, why Defendants' motion to dismiss should not be granted and/or this action dismissed for Plaintiff's failure to prosecute and comply with Court orders. Even without an extension by the Court, Plaintiff's requested extended deadline of July 12, 2024, to file her opposition has passed and she has not opposed the motion. Under the Local Civil Rules for the Central District of California, Plaintiff's failure to file timely an opposition may be deemed her consent to granting the motion. See C.D. Cal. L. R. 7-12 ("The failure to file any required document, or the failure to file it within the deadline, may be deemed consent to the granting or denial of the motion . . ."). Moreover, Plaintiff's failure to meet filing deadlines may be deemed failure to prosecute and/or comply with Court orders.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

| Case No. | 8:23-cv-02193-SVW-SSC | Date: <u>July 15, 2024</u> |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Title | Reshma Kamath v. Elwood Lui, et al. | |
| dismiss | ternatively, if Plaintiff files an opposition by July 25, 2024 , this order to show cally discharged, and Plaintiff need not bely. | ause will be |
| order to 25, 202 4 | aintiff is cautioned that failure to file to show cause or an opposition to the mo- l, will result in a recommendation to the this case for failure to prosecute and/or | tion to dismiss by July ne district judge to |
| IT IS SO | O ORDERED. | |
| | | |
| | Initi | als of Preparer ts |